

February 15, 1995 LB 20

they had to stop because it was just too expensive for them to do. So there are other people in the community that help. A list of services were given to me from the United Methodist Church, St. Francis Church, Good Neighbors, St. Mary's Sacred Heart Church and the Blue Ridge Motel which has worked with them, the Salvation Army and some individuals that work. The point of all this is the community is doing the best they can to help these people to help those that want to go home back home. I think all we're asking in this legislation is for those companies to be partners with the community. We understand that the community is growing and doing well from the packing plants that are in Madison County and we appreciate that, but the plants are also making money. This is just a partnership that we would like to have with these companies. If any of you doubt the need for this legislation, I would invite you to come up to Madison County and to talk to some of these people and see what is going on. I'm delighted to hear Senator Bromm say that he has a company that does these things and works well and that company should have no further burden put on it by this legislation. But those companies that are not being responsible are the ones that we need to address and we do need to get them in a partnership with us. I urge you to support the amendment and support the legislation. Thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Day. I understand there is an amendment on the desk. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Maurstad would move to amend the Chambers et al. amendment.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Maurstad.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Yeah, I gave the only copy of the amendment to the Clerk and so I'll try to paraphrase what the intent of the amendment is while they're passing it out. I don't think that it should be real controversial. It deals with Section 4 on page 4 and it is merely adding some language at the end of subsection (1) and subsection (2) relative the commissioner may inspect the employment records or interview an employer when the commissioner has knowledge that there might be a violation or when a complaint would be filed with the commissioner. I understand the intent. I think the intent is appropriate, but to guard against the commissioner arbitrarily going out and stopping by and just arbitrarily visiting with employers, inspecting records without a reason to just seems to me to be a